

### REMARKS

The foregoing amendments are responsive to the Office Action mailed on November 17, 2005. Claims 1, 26-38, 40-41, and 45 are pending in this application. The Examiner has objected to claims 42-44, indicating their allowability if incorporated into independent claims. By the foregoing amendments claims 1, 26, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended, and claims 39, and 42-44 have been cancelled (note claims 2-25 have been previously cancelled). Since claim 39 is being cancelled, claims 40 and 41 have been amended to now depend from claim 32. Thus, claims 1, 26-38, 40-41, and 45 are presented for examination.

Accompanying this communication is a Petition to Extend the prosecution for one month to March 17, 2006.

#### Discussion of the Office Action

In the Office Action of November 17, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and he rejected claims 1, 26-41, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

#### Discussion of Claims 1, 26-38, 40-41 and 45

Claims 1, 26 and 32 have been amended to meet the Examiner's objections. Specifically, each of claims 1, 26 and 32 have been rewritten as independent claims that include the limitations of the claims from which they each originally depended, as suggested by the Examiner. More particularly, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 43, claim 26 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 44, and claim 32 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 39 and 42 (note that claim 42 was inadvertently written to depend from cancelled claim 9 which should have been depending from claim 39 as was apparently self evident by the Examiner). In any event and in view of the amendments to Claims 1, 26 and 32, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 26-38, 40-41 and 45 are now in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 26-38, 40-41 and 45.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Katsula et al, i.e., US Patent 4,317,691. However, in light of Applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 26 as suggested by the Examiner, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 1 and 26-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 26-41 and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Attia, i.e., US Patent 6,080,281, in view of the article from Science and Technology Review. However, in light of Applicants' amendments to claims 1, 26 and 32 as suggested by the Examiner, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Amended Title

The originally submitted title of the invention is apparently nondescriptive, and required a new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicants have revised the titles of the specification and the abstract to read -- PROCESS FOR PREPARING ENERGETIC MATERIALS --. Applicant respectfully submits that the new title is fully descriptive of the described and claimed invention.

Summary

Having amended the title and the claims, , as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 26-38, 40-41 and 45 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of such claims .

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, he is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned at (925) 422-7820.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan H. Thompson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,981

Dated: March 14, 2006